

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-29, 31-33, and 35-38 will remain pending in this application. Claims 11 and 30 were previously cancelled. Claims 15 and 34 are cancelled in this paper. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. For example, the matter added to claims 1 and 20 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraph [0005]. The matter added to claims 9 and 28 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0062]-[0071] and in the Drawings at least at Figures 10-12.

Claims 1-10, 12-29, and 31-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,358,552 (“Snyder”) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 6,732,089 (“Sinn”).

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On March 26, 2008, Examiner Isaac Tecklu and Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Tecklu agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10, 12-29, and 31-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. As per claim 1, Applicant understands the rejection to be based on the premise that Snyder discloses the method as claimed, except for the step of automatically registering each stored procedure with the device database. Sinn is understood to be cited as supplying this missing teaching.

Applicant traverses the rejection. Claim 1 is directed to a method for deploying at least one stored procedure to a device. A data project and a device database are generated within a solution. The data project is associated with the device database. The at least one stored procedure is added to the data project. The at least one stored procedure comprises a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database. A request to build the solution is received. Responsive to the request, each stored procedure in the data

project is automatically embedded into and registered with the device database. The device database is deployed with the at least one embedded stored procedure as a single unit to the device.

As noted above and stated in paragraph [0005] of the instant Specification, the at least one stored procedure comprises a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database. While Fig. 2, step 8, and the related text of Snyder is cited as teaching the step of adding the at least one stored procedure to the data project, column 4, lines 25-26, states that “[a]t step 8, the computer updates the test data object to include the measured value of the test variable.” Applicant respectfully submits that updating a test data object to include a measured value, as disclosed in Snyder, does not suggest adding to a data project a stored procedure that comprises a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database. While, in Snyder, a computer may access a database to update the test data object, it is not seen where Snyder discloses adding a stored procedure to a data object. It is also not seen where Sinn supplies this missing teaching.

Accordingly, Snyder and Sinn fail to disclose, whether considered individually or in combination, all of the elements of claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn at least by reason of this dependency. Claim 20 contains similar limitations to those found in claim 1 and is also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Claims 21-27 depend from claim 20 and are patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn at least by reason of this dependency.

As per claim 9, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Snyder discloses the method as claimed, except for the step of automatically registering each stored procedure with the device database. Sinn is understood to be cited as supplying this missing teaching.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 9 is directed to a method for deploying at least one stored procedure comprising a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database to a device. A first interface is provided that enables a data project containing the at least one stored procedure and a trigger and a device project containing a device database to be generated within a solution. The first interface further enables the stored procedure and the trigger to be associated with the device database.

A second interface is provided that enables the at least one stored procedure and the trigger to be added to an assembly within the data project. A request is received to build the solution. Responsive to the request, the assembly is automatically embedded within and registered with the device database. The device database is deployed with the embedded assembly as a single unit to the device.

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, the at least one stored procedure comprises a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database. Neither Snyder nor Sinn suggests “providing a second interface that enables the at least one stored procedure and the trigger to be added to an assembly within the data project.”

In addition, claim 9 recites that the data project also contains a trigger. As stated at paragraph [0006] of the instant Specification, “[a] trigger is a unique type of stored procedure that runs when data in a specified table is modified using one or more data modification operations. Such modification operations may be updates, deletions, or insertions. A trigger may query or edit table(s) and may include complex SQL statements. A trigger is primarily useful for maintaining relational integrity in the database or enforcing complex business rules and requirements.” While Fig. 2, step 16, and the related text of Snyder is cited as teaching the embedding of an assembly comprising a trigger within the device database, column 4, lines 50-52, states that “[a]t step 16, the computer can store a result indicating whether the measured value violates the limits for the test variable to which the measured value corresponds.” Applicant submits that while this step may involve a “trigger” as that term is used in the field of instrumentation and test measurements, it does not involve a “trigger” as defined at paragraph [0006] of the instant Specification. Rather, Snyder merely teaches storing a result indicating whether a measured value falls outside of normal bounds.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Snyder and Sinn fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 9, whether considered individually or in combination. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Claim 28 contains similar limitations as those found in claim 9 and is also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Claims 15 and 34 have been cancelled. Claims 10, 12-14, and 16-19 depend from claim 9, and claims 29, 31-33, and 35-38 depend from claim 28. These claims are also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn at least by reason of these dependencies.

DOCKET NO.: 303656.01 / MSFT-2787
Application No.: 10/718,951
Office Action Dated: January 8, 2008

PATENT

Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and removed.

DOCKET NO.: 303656.01 / MSFT-2787
Application No.: 10/718,951
Office Action Dated: January 8, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: April 8, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439